P. I. 37 & 93

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1892-93

192 .

(L. C.)

File No 1183 of 92

Serial Nos 1-5

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-5

Index ~~Part~~ B for December 1893

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Pem Kalgirach & Hiranda Ruckal Talak regarding the Khandesh Ship.

WL 2235 GP—20,000—14-6-20

he himself who was
the Shanbhog of the
-kal kuba had been
for a long time dis
-charging the Shan
-bhogi duties of the
above referred "beshi
-ak" villages attached
to Anekal kuba, that
the "inami" of those
villages was being
enjoyed not by him
but by the respective
hukdar Shanbhogs
of those villages, that
there were no separate
accounts for those
villages, that the lands
of those villages ~~were~~
~~being treated~~ had
been measured and
numbered serially
with those of kuba

Anekal and that the existing arrangement might be confirmed and he be allowed to look after the Shan-bhogi duties of those villages and the hukoa Shanbhogs thereof to enjoy their miraasi as usual.

Venkatagiri himself appellant seems to have been deposed before the Amildar that it would not be convenient to separate Harisandra from Anekal Kusba.

vide order no 141 of 28.6.1866

The Dy Supt thereupon ordered that as Venkatagiria himself had deposed to the above effect his application for getting Harisandra separated from Anekal Kusba was rejected.

28.6.66

"Mirasi" although the
Shanbhogi duties of
that village were
actually being perform
-ed by the Shanbhog
of Anekal kusba,
that in the year Bahu
-dhanya Venkatajira
Appellant had been
appointed by the
municipal Vice Presi
-dent of Anekal to
look after the collect
-ion of municipal
house tax, that some
time afterwards ie.
in the year Pramadi
the Mohatarfa work
was again entrusted
to the Kusba Shan
-bhog of Anekal, that
if the Shanbhogi duties
of Harischandra were
separated from those
of Anekal kusba if

would lead to much confusion, ~~and that~~ ~~in his opinion it was not proper~~ and that the shanbhag of Anekal Kusha might as usual look after the moha - tafa work along with his other revenue duties.

The Deputy Comm^r thereupon ordered that the existing arrangement ~~would~~ could not be disturbed till the survey settle - ment. This order was communicated to Venkata - giria appellant. No 664 19-2-84 17-7-84

In 1886 Venkatagiria presented petitions both to the Amildar and to the Deputy Comm^r that ~~his~~ the village of Hari - sandra of which he was Anekal shanbhag might be separated from the Asali village and that he might be allowed to look after the shan dated 8-5-86 and 25-5-86 respectively

bhogi duties of Hari-
-sandra and continue
enjoying the "mirasi"
as attached to the
office.

No 152
dy 26.5.86

The Deputy Commr
directed the Amildar
to submit a report
in the matter.

Subbarayappa Shan
-bhog of Kasba Anekal
deposed before the
Amildar that he
did not know why
the order passed in
Parthiva (more than
60 years old) by the then
Amildar was not given
effect to, which directed
the payment of "mirasi"
of Harisandra to Laksh-
-mipathia who had been
at the time of the said
order Shanbhog of
Kasba Anekal instead
of to Venkatagiria

23.7.86

x
note
There had been
a dispute regarding
the right to receive the
Shanbhogi
"mirasi" of
Harisandra. The
Amildar ordered that
Lakshmipathia Shan
-bhog of Anekal Kasba
should receive it
vide Kannada order
in the file, of Parthiva
magha 10 m.d.

grandfather of the present appellant Venkatajiria, that the appellant alone had however been enjoying the "mirasi" of Harisandra, that he (Subbarayappa) had no objection to Venkatajiria so enjoying the mirasi of Hari-sandra, that at the survey settlement the question of shanbhogi remuneration payable to him might be settled in such manner as Govt might think fit, and that he (Subba-rayappa) was not prepared to under any circumstances to ~~give up~~ renounce his right to perform the Shanbhogi duties

6-8-86

The Amildar then reported to the Deputy Commr that Subbarayappa above named after having first deposed that the question of Shanbhoga remuneration to be fixed for Harisandra might be decided at the time of Survey settlement either in his favor or in favor of Venkatajirca Appellt as the authorities might think fit, had afterwards deposed that he would not agree to the said remuneration being given to ~~the~~ Venkatajirca. The Amildar further reported that ~~although~~ Harisandra was only a Dakhale village attached to Anekal Kusba, ~~still~~ that the name of Venkatajirca was entered however

entered in the Shanbhogs registe of the said village and he alone had been enjoying the Inam lands & other minasi attached to that office, that even at the survey the lands of Harisandra had been measured and numbered serially with those of Kusba Anekal and that the boundaries of the said village had never been separately fixed.

K
The Shanbhogs Regr mentions the name of Venkatā Giri Gowda as having a copy of Regr in the file.

The Deputy Commr thereupon forwarded the records to the Survey Supt for disposal of the case. 15-8-86

The Survey Supt replied that there was no objection to make such arrangements as might be considered proper for 23-8-86

9-7-91

to continue doing the
Shanbhogi duties of
the said Harisandra.

6-7-91

Venkatajiria
deposed that the
Shanbhogi Register
for Harisandra stood
in his name, that
he alone had been
enjoying the Inam
land, Meirasi &c attach-
-ed to the office, that
he should be allowed
to do the Shanbhogi
duties of Harisandra
separately and that
he should not be
deprived of the profits
of the Public Office
potgi amount for
the village to which
he was entitled.

The amildar
in submitting the
above depositions
to the Dy Commr
reported that at
the survey the land

of Harischandra had
not been separately
measured and num
-bered.

The Dy Comm^r
ordered that the
matter might be
placed before him
when he was going
to that place and
that he would decide
it afterwards.

Before the Deputy
Comm^r could decide
the case Venkata
Giria appell^t presented
a petition to grant
regarding his ~~arbarsa~~
privileges referred
to above.

The Dy Comm^r
was requested to
decide the case and
dispose of it early.

The Deputy Comm^r
thereupon referred the
case to the Zamabandi
officer for report.

M^r Madyanatha Aiyr

20-7-91

20 364

6-8-91

29-8-91

Appl memo 96

12-9-91

6-11-91

19
in the matter.

The Deputy Comm.
has accordingly
reported to this
office in his letter
No 460 of 25.11.92
which also gives the
facts of the case.

N.C.H.

20

(7)

M 430 of 1892-93

Appt

Veerakatagurudiya
Harasandra
Anekal Taluq
Bangalore Dt

Respt

Subbarayappa.

The village Anekal has Dabelu 3 villages, each of which has separate Shanbhogues as shewn below.

Anekal — Respt —

Kodathalli — descendants of Ishwarayan

Mallappa Kadathalli — M. Krishnappa

Harasandra — Appt.

The several ~~three~~ ~~enjoy them~~ Shanbhogs who are unconnected with each other enjoy their hereditary in their villages, but Respt was ~~also~~ clerk to the Patels of all the villages, the lands of which ~~were~~ were Inam up. During the survey, all the villages were treated as one & Respt was made the Shanbhog — Appt requests that the villages be separated — The Dy Comr refused to comply with the request & the

appeal is against the order—

no Petn(s) appears to have been
yet fixed & ~~[illegible]~~ each party contrary
to Rule 3 of the Rules.—

Under the circumstances stated
the Govt are unable to comply with the
request of the appt & the appeal is dismissed.

LL
1/11/93

Ent.

Mr
Mr am enquired
~~that~~ Mr appeal
has been dismissed.
LL

is too late by 2 days.

It would be a real hardship if a petitioner residing in the remotest corner of the Province be required to come to Bangalore to present his appeal petn.

In this case the appeal petn is dated so as to bring the appeal just in time. The petn appears to have been sent by post. The difference in this case is of a day or two.

Submitted to the Council for orders

sd/ 31/8/92

Petitioner to be informed

sd/ 15/10/92

Call for Proc with the usual report

sd/ 16/92





The Dewan Bahadur to His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Respected Sir,

A.S. No 178 of 92-93.

The humble petitioner Venkatagiriah Shanbhog of Harwandra annexed village to Anekal Kusba Bangalore District, respectfully begs to state that this is the appeal brought against the decision of the Deputy Commissioner Bangalore District.

1 The right of the Shanbhogship of the said belonged to the petitioner during the four successive Fasles, the fact of which is proved by Regisles and accounts and by the statements of Vyasa Rao and Subbaraya Setty, the late and present Kusba Shanbhogs. Though these documents were presented yet neither the Deputy Commissioner nor the Jamabandi officers have duly taken notice of.

2 The annexed village is evidently mentioned in the old accounts as a separate one. Notwithstanding the petitioner presenting these copies for the very purpose, the case was not justly decided.

3 The petitioner had been applying about the matter since 1862, the order was, that the case would be settled in the Revenue Survey settlement and that there was no reason why he should apply paid them, These documents are herewith enclosed. When he asked the Deputy Superintendent Revenue Survey the order was that he (the Deputy) was not authorised to settle the cases of the kind, & that if the Revenue Board order that the Village should be made separate, the plan or map of the Village would be entered.

4 Upon this the petitioner prayed your honour for kind decision, while your honour vouchsafed to send the case, herein & the Deputy Commissioner to observe of the case.

5 The humble petitioner therefore, prays kindly to have a new or Deputy Commissioners order for the lands and thus to maintain the right of the petitioner that existed during the Sovereignty making him enjoy also in present reign of His Highness the Maharaja the privileges which other Registered Khandoliyas do & have him paid his proportionate salary.

6 He encloses herewith the Deputy Commissioners order dt 5/1, 15/92.

Dated Thana
15th August 1892

I beg to remain
Respected Sir
Your most obedient Servant
D. B. Maggie

(General Serial No. 30.)

5-5-41
28 NOV. 92
Pet 266
DEWAN OF MY

1892.

From The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

6

L.R. 148-92-3

Dated 25th of November 192

Despatched Do

Received

Enclosures No. 1 file 9 P

General No.
D No. 460

In reply to Ch: Secy's Off! Memo No
464 SUBJECT. of the 22nd Ultimo

Reports on petition of Ram
Venkatasetia, Shanbogue
of Harisandra Amrtal
Taluk appealing against
the Dy Com's order regarding
his claim to the Shan-
-boguship of the said
Village

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

Peter Bor Mem 28/11

Rec'd 6 15th August 1893.

D. No. 460.
Endg 1 file

By Commissioners Office.
Bangalore District.
29
Dated 25th November 192

(6)

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

Sir,

In returning the enclosures received with your Official Memo No. 464 dated 22nd Ultimo, I have the honor to state that Harisandra village referred to by the Petitioner is Baicharak and has been added to Kasaba Anekal. The Petitioner is the Registered Shanbogue of the former village, but Subbarayappa Shanbogue of Anekal does the duties of this and similar other Baicharak villages attached to the Kasaba.

* In re Claim to the Shanbogiship of Harisandra, Anekal Taluk.

2. In 1866 the Petitioner requested to separate his village from the Asali and to restore him to the Office. Enquiry showed that the lands of Harisandra village were numbered

Serially with those of the Asali and
the accounts were also mixed up
with that of the Cutter and the Shan-
-bogue had no objection to the
Petitioner enjoying the Service Inam
and Miraee of the Baichanak Village
as heretofore. The Petitioner agreed
to this proposal. The Villages were
not therefore separated. In 1878-79
there was a heavy balance of the
Municipal Fonde Tase, which had
accumulated through the negligence
of the Shanbogue of Kasba Anekal,
whereupon the then Amildar
Abdul Aziz appointed the Petitioner
to look after the Municipal
Collection work. In 1879-80 it was
again entrusted to the Kasba Shanbogue.

3. In 1883 the Petitioner renewed
his Complaint and the then Deputy
Commissioner Colonel Macintire
enquired into the matter and decided
that the then existing arrangement

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore.

Petition
~~Appeal~~ No. 430 of 1892-93

(7)

Appellant. Vs. Respondent.

Venkatagiriayya
of Haniesandra
Anekal Taluk,
Bangalore District

Subbarayappa

L.R. 148-92-4

Petition dated 22-December 1893

The village Anekal has 3 Dakhala villages each of which has separate Shanbogas as shown below:

Anekal - Respondent

Bodankalli - descendants of Bhyrangappa

Mallappa Bodankalli - Sri Krishnappa

Haniesandra - Appellant

2 P. The several Shanbogas who are unconnected with each other enjoy their inam in their villages, but the Respondent was doing duties of all the villages, the lands of

which were mixed up. During the Survey, all the villages were treated as one and Respondent was made the Shanbhog. Appellant requests that the villages be separated. The Deputy Commissioner refused to comply with his request and the appeal is against his order.

3. The Potagi appears to have been got fixed and each party continues to enjoy his Inam.

4. Under the circumstances stated, the Government are unable to comply with the request of the appellant and the appeal is dismissed

By order

Recept.

Sec.

Chief Secretary

Copy to the Deputy Commissioner Bangalore Dist with the Rev. Inam, received with his No. dt. 9.8.1923

By order

Chief secretary

No. 9983 dt. 19.12.1923

Précis

A. S no. 178

Appellant: Venkata
Giria Shanbhog
of Harisandra
in Anekal Taluk.

This is a dispute regarding the right to the Shanbhogi of Harisandra in Anekal Taluk. The facts of the case are as follows:-

Harisandra is one of the dakhale villages attached to Anekal Kusba. In 1866 Venkat-Giria appellant presented a petition to the Dy Supt Bangalore that he was the hukdar shanbhog of Harisandra and had been enjoying the "mirasi" &c attached to

to the office, that the
said Harisandra
having been however
added to Anekal kusba
the Shanbhog of the
latter village had
been performing the
Shanbhogi duties of
the former village, that
the said Harisandra
might be treated as
a separate village and
that he might be allow
-ed to look after the
Shanbhogi duties there.
That petition was referred
to the Amildar for
report. One Vyasa
rayappa Shanbhog of
Anekal kusba deposed
before the Amildar that
Harisandra and some
other becharak villages
had been attached to
Anekal kusba, that

On the 21st December 1878 the appellant was appointed by the Amildar of Anekal to look after the accounts and collection of mohatarfa tax in Anekal kusba since the Shanbhog of the said kusba Anekal had been unable to look after those duties along with his other revenue duties. The appellant seems to have discharged the above duties only for a year and to have received remuneration for it for that period. Since the year Pramadi the Shanbhog of Anekal kusba has alone been

vide Amildar's
reply to Dy Comm's
No 451, of 7th 84

looking after the
Mohatarfa work and
his other revenue duties.

vide do. report
of the am

In 1883 Venkata
-giria appellant presented
a petition ~~to the~~
~~Amildar and~~ to the Deputy
Comm^r that he might
be allowed to look
after the mohatarfa
work ~~of~~ of Anekal
kusba or the other Sham
bhogi duties.

16-8-83

The Amildar was
thereupon directed
to submit a report
in the matter.

October 1883

The Amildar reported
that Harisandra was
one of the dakhale
villages attached to
Anekal, that Venkata
giria appellant was
the ~~hakdar~~ shanbhog
of the said Harisandra
and was enjoying the

no 885
5

the discharge of the Shan-
bhogi duties ~~from~~ though
~~they~~ there were two
kuloors to the office.

The Deputy Comm.r
then ordered that the
case should be decided
at the time of survey
settlement and that
till then the Shan
bhogi duties might
continue to be per-
formed as usual.

31-8-86

On the 19th Decr.
1890 venkatagiria appl.t
presented a petition to
the Dy Comm.r that
Harisandra might be
separated from Kuba
Anekal and that it
might be treated as
a separate village ~~in~~
~~abovementioned~~.

Reference was again
made to the survey
dep.t in the matter
and the Dy Supdt of Survey
thereupon ~~observed~~ re-
-plied that the case

5-4-91

843
7th May 1891

was one, which might be
disposed of by the Dy
Commr and that in
case the Dy Commr
wished to have the villages
separated ~~the Dy Com~~ ~~no objection~~ it would
be done accordingly.

On the 3d June 1891
the Dy Commr directed
the Amildar to report
if it was necessary
to separate the villages.

Subbarayappa and
venkatajiria above
named appeared before
the Amildar and gave
their depositions.

Subbarayappa deposed
that from time
immemorial his family
alone had been discharging
the Shanbhogi duties
of Harischandra, that
the Potgi that might
be fixed for that village
should be given to him
and he alone permitted

Jamakhandi officer held an inquiry into the case and ordered as follows:

" The petitioner Venkatgiri prays that the Vechivak village of Harisandra attached to the asali Anekal kusba may be treated as an independent village and the Shanbhogi duties thereof allowed to be performed by him. But it is clear that the above patkhale village of Harisandra has neither its boundaries defined nor its lands separately numbered and that the Shanbhog of the asali village Anekal kusba has for a very long time been looking after the Shanbhogi duties of Harisandra. The village of Harisandra

never having been
separated from the
asali village and
the petitioner never
having performed the
shenbhogi duties thereof
no orders can now
be passed summarily
allowing the petitioner
to do the shenbhogi
duties of the said Hari
-Sundra. With regard
to the miras he is
claiming nothing
can be done now as
it has been stopped
under the general
orders ~~of~~ of Govt on
the subject."

12-5-92 No 14
to the Dy C

The Deputy Commr
confirmed the above
order of the jamabandi
officer.

17-5-92

The petitioner has
now appealed to this
office against the
above order.

The Dy Commr was
requested to report

25-10-92

Memo No. 10
(General Serial No. 4)

1892.

No. 430.

Name of Petitioner. Venkatagiria

Village. Anekal

Taluk. Do

District. Bangalore

Date of Arzi. 15th August

Date of Receipt. 17th August

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. one.

ABSTRACT.

With Regard to the office of Shanbhog of the depopulated village Narasandra, annexed to Anekal, Petitioner appeals against the Dy. Comm'rs order No. 52 dy 17th May 92, the substance of which is as follows—

Your request cannot be granted as the Jamabandi Officer after holding an enquiry passed order No 141 on the 14th inst. to the effect that the village in question had no seperate S. numbers and boundaries but was included with the main village and

Claim to
the office of a
the village -

Order appealed
against is dated - 17. 5. 92

If is not
known when the
got it.

Appeal Petn
dated - 15-8-92.

was received
in this office on - 17. 8. 92

211 of the I.C.
prescribes a period
90 days within
the Appeal should
be brought.
the period in this case comes

may - 14 days.
June - 30 "
July - 31
Aug 15 or 17 days.
90 or 92 days.

212 makes it clear
the appeal petn should
be presented. If the date
of receipt of petn is taken
into account the appeal

its accounts were prepared
by the Shanbhog of the latter
village, that it was never
never seperated from the
main one and Petitioners
never looked after its work,
and that therefore the village
in question could not be
seperated and Petitioner
appointed its Shanbhog as
desired.

S.V.

Pet 464

(5)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 430 dated 15 - August/92 received at the Dewan's Office from Venkatazira Shanboguru of Hiresandra Taluk, appealing ag. the Deputy Commrs order rega his claim to the Shanboguti of the said village

L.R. 148-92-2

From the Commr Kolar 25/10/92

is forwarded, together with its one enclosures, to the Deputy Commrs Bangalore Distt for submission of Proceedings and a report on the facts of the case and on the points taken in the petition

2 The Petn should be returned.

By Order,

Draft

22/10/92

Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE, 26 Octr 1892

M S.V.

Encl returned

25/10/92

should not be disturbed until the Survey Settlement

4. In May 1886 the Petitioner prayed for the separation of his village, as the Survey work was then going on in the Taluk. The Deputy Commissioner finding that the lands of Harisandra village were measured and numbered serially with those of Kasba Anekal with which the former was clubbed, forwarded the record to the Survey Superintendent for disposal. That Officer, in reply, stated that the Survey accounts were prepared with reference to the old records, but that in case of there being two Nakkadars for one village, the Dy Commissioner might suggest any arrangement that he deemed proper, or if he liked it, the villages could be separated. The records were then referred by Mr. Madhava Rao to the Jamabundi Officer Mr. Vydyanatha Iyer, who after hearing

the parties on the spot reported that it was impossible to separate the Bancharak Village from the Asali Anekal, as the villages had been clubbed together for a long time and as the duties had from time immemorial been discharged by the Kasba Shanbogue. This was approved of by me.

The records are enclosed.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most Obedient Servant

B. Robertson

for Dy Commissioner

WHS

No. 430

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
PETITION DEPARTMENT,

19 Dec 1893

Endorsement granted to Venkatagiriah of Hiresandra
Anekal Taluk

in reply to his Petition Registered No. 430 dated 15-8-92
appealing against the order of the Deputy Commr.
regarding his claim to the Shanbogueship of the said village.

Petitioner is informed that ~~the~~ his appeal has been dismissed

2 The enc: is returned

L.R. 148-92-5

"By Order"

Chief Secretary.

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore,—9-2-93—2000.